

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 have been examined. Claims 2, 3, 13 and 17-23 are hereby canceled by this Amendment without prejudice or disclaimer.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claim 12 under §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

In particular, the Examiner contends the term “repeating” does not clearly indicate what elements are repeated.

Applicant submits the present amendment to claim 12 obviates this rejection.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under § 102(a) as being anticipated by Nunokawa et al. (US 7,008,125). Applicant traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, storing, a correction amount that is for correcting a target carry amount and that is set in accordance with a remaining amount of a recording medium, in a storage element provided in or on said recording medium.

In the rejection, the Examiner contends Nunokawa’s roll of paper 32 and associated memory 332 disclose the features recited in claim 1. However, Applicant submits Nunokawa’s memory merely stores a remaining amount of a recording medium (col. 7, lines 60-65). On the other hand, claim 1 recites storing a correction amount that is set in accordance with a remaining amount of a recording medium. Furthermore, this correction amount is for correcting a target carry amount. Consequently, because Nunokawa merely discloses storing the remaining amount of a recording medium, this reference fails to expressly or inherently disclose a correction amount which is used for correcting a target carry amount.


Thus, Applicant submits claim 1 is allowable over Nunokawa for at least this reason. Additionally, because claims 8-12 recited features similar to the feature discussed above with regard to claim 1, Applicant submits these claims are allowable over Nunokawa for at least those reasons set forth above. Finally, Applicant submits claims 4-7 and 14-16 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David P. Emery  
Registration No. 55,154

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 28, 2007